MACHINE TRANSCRIPT · CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Fairfax County Board of Supervisors Land Use Policy Committee, Tuesday, April 25, 2023

Date	Tuesday, April 25, 2023
Place	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length	1h 5m (video)

- Official meeting video (Fairfax County): https://video.fairfaxcounty.gov/player/clip/2833
- Official Board of Supervisors page (Fairfax County): https://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/boardofsupervisors/

> Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-11-04. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:01] Good morning, everyone. We have two items on the agenda, but before we get to those, we have minutes from two meetings, and are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? So seeing none, we'll have those minutes as accepted.

[00:00:17] Our first presentation is on outdoor dining. This is a follow-up. We ask staff to prepare something that takes us past when the emergency ordinance isn't in effect for people. So am I turning it over to Lily to start? Okay, thank you.

[00:00:33] Thank you, Supervisor Smith. Good morning. I'm Lily Guzzo with the Department of Planning and Development in the Zoning Administration Division. With me today, I have Tracy Strunk, Leslie Johnson, and Bill Maland, also with BPD. I'm sorry, one moment. I'm waiting for it. Yes.

[00:01:00] To provide a little background, this topic was added to the Zoning Ordinance Work Program as a Priority 1 item in response to the Board's direction to consider ways to allow the continuation of outdoor dining permitted in parking areas during the COVID emergency.

[00:01:22] In October of last year, staff presented to this committee an overview of the land use programs implemented during the COVID emergency and recommendations for a proposed path forward to either sunset or continue the program.

[00:01:38] There was consensus that the majority of the programs would be allowed to sunset at the end of the one-year grace period following the board's declaration to end the COVID emergency, except for the outdoor dining program. At the same meeting, staff presented possible approaches to allow the continuation of outdoor dining permitted under the emergency ordinance.

[00:02:00] There was a support for an administrative permit approach, but on a one-time basis versus a yearly renewal. Staff has further studied the topic and researched neighboring jurisdictions to bring you the proposed options for consideration.

[00:02:17] THE EXISTING ZONING ORDINANCE DOES NOT DEFINE OUTDOOR DINING, HOWEVER, OUTDOOR SEATING IS GENERALLY TREATED AS AN ACCESSORY USE AND IS ALLOWED BY RIGHT IN ALL ZONING DISTRICTS WHERE RESTAURANTS AND CRAFT BEER PRODUCTION ESTABLISHMENTS ARE PERMITTED.

[00:02:37] Additional parking is not required for outdoor seating when the number of outdoor seats does not exceed 20 for an establishment with a gross floor area of less than 5,000 square feet, and when the number of outdoor dining seats does not exceed 32 for an establishment with a gross floor area of more than 5,000 square feet.

[00:02:58] Providing outdoor seating above these numbers requires the submission and approval of a parking tabulation to demonstrate that the number of existing parking spaces on site meets the minimum of street parking requirement for all users, including the outdoor dining seating.

[00:03:17] The emergency ordinance or that we refer to as emergency ordinance, the uncodified ordinance, allowed the setup of outdoor dining subject to certain conditions without any requirement for an individualized approval in association with establishments already approved to operate with a non-residential use permit or a certificate of occupancy and a food establishment permit with the board's declaration of the end of the COVID-19.

[00:03:48] emergency this year the majority of the programs are allowed to sunset at the end of the one year grace period except outdoor dining that is proposed to be codified with this amendment as we want to offer a seamless transition from what was permitted in the emergency ordinance the proposal is to carry forward the approach set forth in the in the emergency ordinance including standards that address ADA, alcohol, furniture, life safety, location, parking, pedestrian

[00:04:22] circulation, and signs. The proposed amendment will define outdoor dining as a permitted accessory used to restaurants and other similar uses that have a food establishment permit. The proposal also requires that the outdoor dining setup does not include any permanent structures and that all tables, chairs, umbrellas, and tents, lighting, and any other accessories be removable and maintained in good visual appearance and condition. Outdoor dining will continue to be permitted in all zoning districts unless expressly prohibited by any applicable

[00:04:59] proper conditions or any other approval conditions. Any area used for outdoor dining must be located entirely on impervious surfaces and must be clearly demarcated and may not obstruct any fire equipment, building entrance, or exit, any other area marked or designated for emergency egress or ADA accessibility or pedestrian passage. Consistent with what is proposed with the parking reimagined zoning ordinance amendment, staff proposes no additional parking be required

[00:05:32] for outdoor dining, regardless of its size or location. Outdoor dining on private property will continue to be allowed by White, provided that the size does not exceed 50% of the indoor dining floor area of the establishment that it is associated with. The total area devoted to outdoor dining serving multiple establishments may also not exceed 50% of the total combined indoor floor area for all establishments. An option for consideration is provided that would

[00:06:08] reduce the allowable outdoor dining area to as low as 25 percent or increase it to as high as 75 percent of the indoor dining area. To mitigate potential noise issues related to activities in outdoor dining areas, the hours of operation is proposed to generally conform to the business hours of the establishment itself, the principal use, but in no event can occur before 7 a.m.

[00:06:36] or after 10 a.m. when the outdoor dining is located directly adjacent to single family development or as otherwise approved by the board in conjunction with other zoning approvals. An option for consideration is that the outdoor dining cannot occur before 9 a.m. if it's directly adjacent to single family development.

[00:07:00] Staff proposes any outdoor dining located in parking areas be allowed only with the issuance of an administrative permit by the zoning administrator. A one-time application fee of $205 is also proposed, which is the same amount as the current fee for other temporary uses, and that will be applicable to only the administrative permit outdoor dining.

[00:07:24] One option is provided to consider a lower range between $100 and $205 for the administrative fee. The size of the outdoor dining and parking areas would still be subject to the 50% of the indoor dining area proposed.

[00:07:40] If an establishment provides outdoor dining on both the sidewalk and the patio and the parking area, the cumulative size still would not be able to exceed 50% of the indoor dining area of the establishment. As required in the emergency ordinance, sufficient on-site parking must be maintained for on-site users, and it may not reduce the total number of parking spaces below the minimum required for the site.

[00:08:11] Since the adoption of the emergency ordinance, relatively few complaints have been received regarding outdoor operations, and staff believes this simplified approach will allow continuation of the outdoor dining experience for both customers and establishments.

[00:08:27] Following your direction today, we will further refine the proposed changes and share with stakeholders including shopping center owners, restaurant operators, and other food and beverage operators. We also plan to hold several public outreach meetings in spring and/or summer and anticipate potential authorization and public hearings in summer or end or fall of this year.

[00:08:56] With that, I conclude my presentation, and I am available to answer any questions you may have. Thank you. Thank you, Lily, and I appreciate the timeline because that should be able to put us in shape that there will be no delay when the emergency ends in March.

[00:09:13] Mr. Chairman. Yeah, thank you. Good presentation, and thank you for bringing this forward quickly as the chair said, to make sure we don't have interruption for people who are already using this flexibility. The same experience, I don't know about other offices, but very few, I can't think of any complaints, honestly, since it's been put in place, which is a good thing. I guess the question I have with

the administrative permit, I'm presuming that's a one-time permit, that once that's issued, there's not a renewal requirement that comes up over a specified period of time.

[00:09:47] Is that right? We are not proposing any of those. It's going to be a one-time permit as currently proposed. Okay. And so unless there's substantiated complaints or violations, that permit stays in perpetuity. So I guess the question is, is it in the name of the tenant, or is it something issued to, if it's in a shopping center or retail center or just a freestanding restaurant that might be owned by someone else is the is the permit in the name of the restaurant operating at the time or does it run with the land it's the the outdoor dining itself is supposed to be accessory to a specific restaurant or

[00:10:27] establishment so that's already permitted so I'm thinking it would be the admin administrative permit would also be issued for that specific restaurant so if the tenant changed but it was the same operation in essence they would have to come back through and get another administrative permit? I think at this point, yes. I mean, we do kind of similar with non-residential use permits. If the owner changes, they have to come in and get a new non-residential use permit. The only other option I could see, and I'm sorry, I'm Leslie Johnson, zoning administrator, would be if the shopping center owner wanted to set up a central with, you know, the number of tenants

[00:11:06] that he has. I mean, I could see perhaps where the shopping center owner may obtain approval. So that's something we can continue to talk about and maybe ask some of the shopping center owners what they might prefer. A lot of times they would rather have the tenants kind of deal with that versus...

[00:11:24] Yeah, and actually where you just took that, Leslie, is exactly where I was going. I think if there was an option for a particular center that wanted to have communal outdoor dining that serves multiple tenants, maybe not even full sit-down restaurants, but in some cases, you know, an ice cream parlor or something, I don't know.

[00:11:44] I just want to make sure that the owners of these properties would have an opportunity to maybe apply for a communal outdoor dining area that might serve multiple tenants, and then that would run with the shopping center, maybe not necessarily with those tenants. I think it's just something to look at because it's a nuance to this that we just want to make sure we have a good, fair answer to going into.

[00:12:07] But the rest of this looks fine with me. I'm certainly okay with the 50% option that staff has put out there, too. It seems fair to me. I know that was one of the range questions, you know. But the main thing I want to make sure of is the permit process is easy for people to understand.

[00:12:27] It's clear that it runs with the tenant, except in maybe circumstances where it might be applied for for an entire center. And I think we need to think that through. And, again, you know, we're only requiring the administrative permit if they want to locate in the parking lot. Right. You know, if they want to use their sidewalk area and that kind of thing.

[00:12:47] I mean, the other issue would be if it goes over the cumulative 50%. I mean, some of that could possibly require a site plan if they want to use more permanent fixtures, you know. But, again, I think. So that's why we were trying to streamline it to make it only if they were really going into the parking lot where we would have the administrative permit.

[00:13:07] Right. I appreciate that. And I mean, I appreciate all the thought that's been put into backstops. I mean, there have to be rules and restrictions in place here. But I think one thing, at least I've observed,

and I think many have, is that outdoor dining is a lot more popular now than it ever was before the pandemic.

[00:13:24] and it has not brought on the harm or concerns that I think maybe we might have thought about when we originally wrote restrictions on outdoor dining. And so I do absolutely appreciate the flexibility and the reasonableness. Thank you.

[00:13:40] I have Dahlia and then Walt. Okay, thank you. And I think, again, I agree with a lot of what the chairman said. I think some of my questions are along the same lines, and I really appreciate the flexibility we're offering. I think, like he said, I haven't heard a lot of complaints, but still see a few that are doing well and continue to maintain their open space, and I think it would be good to continue.

[00:14:04] A couple of questions, so maybe related to that, I was wondering, I don't see on the list about food trucks, if there are currently areas, whether it's at a shared parking, it might be under the shared area, whether it's a location that's inviting different food trucks over time if they would be the ones to apply for the permit so that, you know, if they wanted rotation of food trucks, the individual trucks wouldn't have to do that?

[00:14:32] We currently have a permitting system for food trucks. We do have a location permit and also operation permit that allows up to four food trucks, I believe, at a time in any commercial site development. So we have not looked at foot trucks in association with this outdoor seating area, but that may be something we can look at if they are proposing to provide, was the question if outdoor seating is proposed adjacent to foot trucks. Yes, we have not looked at that because

[00:15:10] we already have a system to allow foot trucks out there, but we can definitely take a look at that. I think it would be interesting to monitor or keep an open mind as we're looking at some of the shared spaces. Yes, that makes sense. I think that would be really helpful.

[00:15:26] And then my only other question, and I agree again with the 50%. I'm okay with the 7 a.m. start. I understand this will go out to public input. I'm with the application fee as well. I'm comfortable with what you've proposed. And then my only other question is for the, when we say permanent structures, so does that include or not include any kind of they seem to be not to be permanent kind of wooden

[00:15:59] structures that have a roof covering or is this only mean tent is the only one that's allowed semi-permanent because I think some if they know they're going to have it year-round started with a tent and maybe have looked at some pseudo-permanent wooden structures structures similar to like trellises and correct. At this point we're only looking at non-permanent structures which are like barriers and planters and tents at the

[00:16:33] most. Any kind of permanent structure that is vaulted to either the face of the building or the ground other than a tent is not proposed to be included as is what is being approved, and we do need to run it by the building official and the fire marshal to make sure that any such structure may not create other unintended concerns related to fire.

[00:17:06] Yeah, I think if we're able to do that, I just know for some it just doesn't, you know, if they're going to have it again year-round, it might make sense to make sure that they are up to code but that we allow that flexibility but leslie you were going to add something well i'm thinking and maybe something to your um i mean if you have like um when we're thinking permanent we're also thinking like a permanent

awning that's affixed to the building right which needs permitting and all sorts of things i mean if you're just talking about a trellis or you know to hang plants down and it's not covered it's i think the concern about being in the parking lot is and even on

[00:17:45] the sidewalk is that, you know, there may be building permits required to do that, and the whole idea was to make it easy to be removed in the case of an emergency, and for fire purposes, there's a lot of detail in the emergency ordinance as far as the tents and the fire stuff, so I think it's something we can definitely look at if that's what we're talking about to maybe sort of better define what we mean by permanent and non-permanent, but I've also seen and I think Lily had a picture at least at one point where people have put in those

[00:18:20] temporary enclosed tents like in parking spaces for like purposes for bugs or whatever and so I'm a little at what point do you draw the line that maybe that needs site plan approval or something else and once you start enclosing things you got FAR and so we were trying to stay away from all of that, if we could help it, because then that kind of kicks in a little bit more review.

[00:18:49] But it's something we can definitely talk about and think about. Tracy Strunk, I just wanted to jump in and say it's not that there's not a path forward for someone who wants to do that. I want to make that clear, too. It's just we're trying to draw a line between what can be done easily that might not need building permits, as Leslie said, and that can go smoothly. And if someone wants to put up a patio, if they want to do an addition, we absolutely have a way for them to go forward.

[00:19:15] They just are going to have to go through the building permit process. So it's not that they can't do it. It's just they might need to do it. And I guess it's just to still have that flexibility that we're not offering with outdoor dining. Okay, perfect. Thank you. Walter and then Pat. Thank you, Madam Chair.

[00:19:31] So in reading through the white paper, one thing I'd ask staff to look at and think about a little bit is, you know, Well, not so much in Fairfax County, but in some of the other jurisdictions, including some of our towns. We're seeing more, I would call it retail, trail-facing retail, trail-facing restaurants along the W&OD in particular.

[00:19:53] And I would want to make sure that this accommodates where our zoning ordinance has jurisdiction. It actually anticipates interest in, well, frankly, outdoor seating along the W&OD trail. if not other trails, I don't know, there might be some other ones, but, and I can't really get my head around all the different situations, but we certainly have parking lots that above the W&OD trail. We have, you know, some restaurants that are sort of linked to the trail already, some outdoor seating. So, but if you could look at that a little bit more, because I think we're going to

[00:20:32] see more interest in that. And I think there certainly is customer interest. Certainly sitting and having a meal, looking out over the trails a little nicer than maybe a, you know, six-lane highway. I'm not saying those aren't good places, but, you know, and just kind of anticipating where this might actually make some sense too. So thank you, Madam Chair.

[00:20:57] Thank you, Pat. I just want to add, I think it's a good thing. I think 50% is probably the right number. On outreach, I assume we're going to include Visit Fairfax, Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington, and NBR LTA are kind of some of the restaurant groups, too, and that would be it.

[00:21:22] Thank you. John? Two things, and I may have missed this, but, you know, in the winter, they put up the tents and the outdoor heaters. Did you cover that?

[00:21:38] Is that going to be allowed? Yes, tents and heaters that meet certain standards that was already in the emergency ordinance is proposed to be carried forward.

[00:21:54] So that would be permitted provided they meet. Okay, good. If it's on the sidewalk or the patio, it's by right, if not by administrative permit, if it's in the parking area. Good, okay. But it would still have to meet the fire marshal.

[00:22:09] The fire marshal is the entity that issues the tent permits, and they have a tent permit for if you're certain sizes. And then they have rules about putting in open flame and heaters, so you have to make sure the distance is right and they're open sides.

[00:22:30] It's doable, and we've had that already in the ordinance. So we were just, again, planning to carry that forward. doable and easy are not necessarily the same thing sometimes is it going to be easy well i mean the fire marshal has issued the tent permits um you know all throughout the covet so okay i see the fire marshal's here john if he wants to talk about that he can um i'll ask my other question

[00:23:01] while he's coming or not he's going to be here any minute now okay good morning john walser with the fire marshal's office so there there are certain parameters that the fire code already envisions for for tents and the the threshold within the fire code is greater than 900 square feet so that's a fairly large tent it's 30 by 30 anything bigger than that would would be a permittable tent less than that don't less than that there's no no permit requirement they still

[00:23:38] have to comply with the fire code but the fire marshal wouldn't necessarily have the the oversight directly unless there was a complaint gotcha thank you very much uh the other question i had was i agree with all your proposals but with respect to the limit size uh 50 of indoor dining area are there examples around the county of areas that are small like ice cream parlors things like that that might that 50 of their space might not be enough that maybe we need a minimum that if you're

[00:24:16] In this type of business, you can 50% or at least 500 feet or something like that. When we say 50%, are we making it impossible for some of the restaurants, carryouts, stuff like that, to actually have this opportunity?

[00:24:42] I'm thinking of Milwaukee Custard up in Chantilly, you know, that has seats outside. and you know and i'm thinking about how we would you know is that 10 by 10 you know and and you know we don't even you know right now we're not even regulating they're just putting the seats out there and they're doing their thing and so we kind of want to continue that um and i don't know how big so if you take a 1500 square foot restaurant you know like a ice cream parlor that

[00:25:17] you mentioned 50 of that is 750 square feet that's a pretty big area to have outdoor dining so i think we feel pretty comfortable that that 50% will accommodate most of the restaurants and smaller venues that want to have that outdoor dining. Again, as to Tracy's point, if they want to have more than that, then we might have to look at something else. Like maybe they need to get a site plan approval because they're coordinating off of a much larger area. Okay. As we finalize

[00:25:52] if there's any way to get any information about who we would be precluding because of space. I think that's a good question to ask some of the restaurant operators and businesses to see what they are

looking at so we can follow up on that.

[00:26:08] Thank you. Okay, I don't see any other comments. Thank you for all the work on this, and hopefully your community outreach will go well. Thank you. Thank you. The next presentation is going to be about the Reston Comprehensive Plan.

[00:26:28] As everyone knows, we had a presentation about this back in October. Isn't that terrible? I don't remember exactly. And the board had some questions and concerns about part of it. And so this is our chance to get an update from staff about what's happening.

[00:26:47] And Commissioner Carter is going to join us at the table. He is not making a presentation, but he will be here if any questions come up that it would be appropriate for him to answer. And so I never find out who I'm supposed to kick it off to.

[00:27:04] Okay, Chris, we're kicking it off to you. Thank you very much. Glad to receive. Thanks. Fair catch. Thank you, Supervisor Smith, and glad to be here with the committee again this morning.

[00:27:22] I'm joined by Tracy Strunk, Director of DPD, St. Clair Williams, Senior Planner. So we wanted to provide you an update with what's been going on with the Reston Plan Amendment. Quickly, here's a timeline of events. So we last met with your committee in October, so that was six months ago.

[00:27:42] And since then, there's been a reauthorization of the comp plan, and we've had a couple of Planning Commission workshops and a lot of staff work going on. As I mentioned, we last had a Planning Commission workshop on March the 30th. We had an opportunity to review plan text with the Planning Commission, answer questions.

[00:28:04] And generally, the feedback was favorable, especially as it related to the topics of health and equity and economic development that we've all been kind of wrangling with and massaging over the last few weeks. We'll get more into that in a minute.

[00:28:20] I do want to point out that there's been quite a bit of staff work that's been going on in the midst of a lot of other planning activities like SSPA and things like that. Staff has really been all hands in terms of taking these topics and reviewing them, going back to the task force leads in the community, working with the planning commissioners that are on the committee to encourage dialogue about some of these more sensitive topics.

[00:28:49] So it's been very productive in that sense. And I mentioned there have been two additional planning workshops in the last few months, so in the last six months. And I will mention also that Commissioner Carter has helped facilitate all those conversations with the planning commissioners on that committee.

[00:29:12] So we appreciate his help in sort of guiding that conversation as well. So these are our target dates. This is usually the slide you see at the end, but I just wanted to put this up. And I know that we are talking about that board date and possibly looking at a date at the end of the month of July.

[00:29:28] So there's some flexibility still in this schedule, I believe. But we are certainly targeting a May staff report release, depending on, you know, conversations today and going forward.

[00:29:45] So real quickly, just going to jump to the topic of equity and health and economic development. which has been of concern to the committee. And the Planning Commission had a good idea of sort of

wrapping those topics, those plan elements, into a sort of concluding chapter that tried to capture the spirit of what Ruston Planning was about in a larger sort of societal context.

[00:30:11] And these topics of equity and health and economic development, we see them sprinkled throughout the comprehensive plan, and we have policy plan objectives that address these. So this was an attempt by staff and working with the Planning Commission to take the prescriptive nature out of that text and have it more reflective of just the community's desires to advance these topics within their own community.

[00:30:39] And we'll get into them specifically in the next three slides. But that was sort of the spirit in which we approached putting these topics together and trying to consolidate them in sort of a meaningful way. And I will say that quite a bit of the original task force language has been pared back.

[00:30:59] These are much shorter sections now and sort of shorter and to the point, I would say, in a lot of respects. So just diving in here real quickly, the equity chapter or the equity element of this concluding chapter reflects really the work that's been going on ever since the rest of the community introduced this subject to us.

[00:31:27] And as we've mentioned before, this has been a work in progress along with the county. And as Carla Bruce and Robin Wilson and our own DPD equity program manager, Michelle Stalhut, have worked to figure out what makes sense in terms of a comprehensive plan and how can we interpret the desires of the community into comprehensive plan language that is meaningful but not prescriptive.

[00:31:54] And I think we've achieved that. As you know, we are working on a weekly basis in trying to determine equity impacts on various actions that are taken by the board. So it's a moving target and one that I think that we're honing in on better as we move along.

[00:32:12] And I think that this language and the proposed language in the rest of the comp plan sort of reflects the spirit of those equity goals. Likewise, community health. You know, we have a human services element of our policy plan that really speaks more to facilities and the providing of services.

[00:32:33] So this chapter does go beyond that a bit and tries again to reflect the desires of the community in terms of creating a healthy community and their vision for what a healthy community might look like.

[00:32:49] And lastly, the economic development element has been pared back some, but still reflects, again, and doesn't stray from the policy objectives that are in the policy plan for economic development. And that policy plan talks about the need for strong partnerships.

[00:33:09] And so this proposed plan language actually names some of those partnerships, the Rustin Association, other groups that developers are like-minded people that are coming to the rest of the area would be mindful of. So we feel like this language in the economic development section complements the existing policy plan without, again, prescribing new policy.

[00:33:36] But that's our take, and we're open for comments and feedback as well. The next eight or so slides touch on all of the other topics that you know are in the comprehensive plan and the elements that are being considered in this update.

[00:33:54] I can go through them kind of quickly and just let you know these topics, but I want to respect your time to ask questions and have a dialogue with staff and Commissioner Carter as well. So I'll just run through these real quickly just to refresh your memory as to the plan elements.

[00:34:13] But they're land use, environmental stewardship, affordable housing, And this probably is a table worth noting that we are making a recommended change to sort of redistribute the AMI for the TSA areas, as it refers to workforce dwelling units.

[00:34:34] So you can see a table there that compares current plan language with what's now proposed for the TSA. You'll see the percentages remain the same, but yet again, a refocus into the lower AMIs. Transportation elements have been updated.

[00:34:53] We have some street grid questions that are probably going to need to be resolved at the planning commission level, but we've had full and open dialogue with the community, and we've gotten a lot of feedback from the community on transportation impacts.

[00:35:14] Parks and open space are relatively unchanged. We've asked to retain the flexibility to place the 12 equivalent fields within the TSA, depending on creativity of developers and the availability of open space.

[00:35:31] We've also updated heritage resources, public facilities, and public art. So that's a very quick run-through without getting into deep dive on any one topic, but we have folks here that can answer questions and answer questions as well.

[00:35:50] Thanks, Chris. I'm going to start with a couple, and then I'm going to turn to the chairman. I think it is definitely worth looking at and talking in detail, slide 12, with the affordable housing and to understand process. I first got my briefing from staff.

[00:36:08] I think that the chart is better because it talks about the current rest and what's there in the 12%. I know when we changed it for the rest of the county and Tyson's, there was a work group that worked through this. So, you know, the orange column, you can see you move things down.

[00:36:25] So if you could talk a little bit about how you got to that and any public process you had to get there and anything else that's going to happen with that. Yep. St. Clair Williams, Department of Planning and Development. So that was something that was kind of worked with during the task force phase of this process.

[00:36:44] It was really looking at, again, it was started with the task force recommending taking a look at changes to the workforce dwelling unit policy. One of the things we looked at, there were students from, I believe it was Virginia Tech, And they kind of worked through taking a look and seeing as far as the changes to AMI percentages, what would actually work, what would be feasible.

[00:37:14] So we did work through that. They presented to the task force, you know, so everybody had a full understanding how all that works. So that's what we worked through. And, again, that was just looking at the rental unit. So that's why at this point we're saying it's just changes to the rental WDUs.

[00:37:31] We figure there needs to be further work to look at, you know, for sale units before any changes were made there. And again, as Chris mentioned, it's really just changing the targeted average median income levels, AMI. As you may recall, there was a recent amendment to the work which was only, you know, countywide, but rest was not a part of that.

[00:37:52] So we did take a look at kind of comparisons of what changes were made there and what really could work for the rest in TSAs. TSAs. So again, that's where it is going, looking at the 6% for 71 to 80, 3% for the 61 to 70 AMI, and then 3% up to 60 AMI. Outside of the rest in TSAs, the rental would be same as

the countywide policy. And so in those discussions, because I know when we had the task force, the development community was involved in that. Did they have any involvement in this? I mean, they had an opportunity to see the initial recommendations we haven't at least we

[00:38:30] haven't received a lot of feedback or issues or concerns with what's been proposed at this point so I think part of this public process is you do outreach and go to the Planning Commission you'll be open to hearing any feedback about that is correct so once the task force recommendations were released in September we had several community engagement meetings both virtual and in person. We had a public input link on the Reston Study website where people provide comments. So we've been open to taking in feedback and having any meetings.

[00:39:07] Okay. Supervisor Smith, could I jump in for a minute, Tracy Strunk? I just wanted to make clear the percentage and the number of units that is proposed in this text is the same that was already in the um in the current plan so the change here was to bring the ami in line with the work that was done in the wider county but the number so that's that's kind of the interplay of those two things yeah thanks thank you i appreciate that um i think you did a good job with the board's concerns about the equity chapter and the community health chapter um i would tell

[00:39:42] you that i still have concerns in the planning a new town chapter in the economic development piece I'm concerned that some of it, even though you say in here that it's not required, I don't know if it will come across like that.

[00:40:01] To me, there's confusion about some of the language when you talk about resting in conjunction with fair facts and, you know, what does that mean? It doesn't really seem to be the way we do things. And so some of these strategies, I just think it's still too much in this part.

[00:40:22] you know, we can talk more later. I want to open it up to my colleagues. But it's that line of what should be in the comp plan and what is other aspirational things that people want to talk about with rest and where is the right place to put that. And to me, I don't want to create confusion when somebody's going through the land use process about what really is required and what's not. And so I still don't feel that clarity there. I'm going to turn it to the chairman now.

[00:40:52] Thank you, and I do want to start off by saying I think this is infinitely better than what we saw before, and I really appreciate the improvements that have been made to it. I guess a question that I have is in that same area, the economic development piece, and before we list the goals on page 139, it does say the following goals build on the five countywide objectives and policies in the county policy plan, and I'm wondering if you could, not today, but provide us kind of a side-by-side that shows what those objectives

[00:41:27] are and how they align with the goals that are in here, because that's a statement of fact that I don't necessarily disagree with, but I'd like to see it, how they build upon those, because I think it kind of goes to the heart of what Kathy was saying, and I don't necessarily have a problem with any of these goals, but I do want to see how they build off of the county-wide objectives and policies in the county policy plan, and I'm assuming, and this kind of relates to the question that was made earlier about the affordable units, is that I don't know how much of the economic development pieces of this have been

[00:42:03] socialized with the EDA, with other groups that work on economic development, and maybe that's, this is their intersection to review that and make comment on it. I'm just curious if they were involved at all in the process leading to the draft goals that we have here.

[00:42:21] Sorry, I've shared the text with DEI staff, not EDA staff, but that's a good suggestion, and we can expand that. Yeah, I think we should socialize it, because I don't know that there's any problem with it, but I also want to make sure that there's not differences of opinion or nuanced parts of this that could be massaged.

[00:42:41] Just make sure that the people who are working on economic development for the county are working on it in concert with what is in this plan for Reston, and there's not an unforeseen conflict between the two, and just to make sure that we do that.

[00:42:59] And then I do want to channel Penny Gross because she's not here for a moment, just to prove to you that I've read every word of this. In Goal 4, it talks about quality of life, and it talks about competitive WAGs.

[00:43:17] I know we invite dogs and arrest them, but I think that's meant to be wages, Competitive wages? It's a big difference between the two. Big catch. And it says regardless of wage scale. I would like to understand that a little bit better because obviously we want competitive wage jobs everywhere in the county, but I'm not sure what regardless of wage scale means.

[00:43:40] And kind of to Kathy's point, it seems like a pretty specific thing for the comp plan, even if it's overarching guidance. But that's pretty specific. We're not just saying competitive wages. is we're conditioning that regardless of wage scale, and I don't understand what that means.

[00:43:59] Fair enough. Thank you for the comments. Yeah, so if that could just get ironed out. We'll do a follow-up, yes. We understand what that means. And then I think to the extent that we also understand that these goals, I know that evaluating comprehensive plan amendments is a fine art.

[00:44:18] You're balancing a lot of things. I'm sure there will be some entities that will come in that may not want to share that level of detail that we might want to be able to evaluate whether or not it's in alignment necessarily with, say, for instance, goal four. And I just want to get a reassurance from staff that, again, these are guiding principles. They're in the comp plan. They will be looked at in concert with an application that comes in, but they're not absolute to the point where one of these elements is not met. Staff is going to feel compelled just based on that one element that we

[00:44:55] must recommend denial of this comp plan amendment. That's not the intention, is that right? That is correct. That is not the intention. Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. So like I said, I think a huge improvement over where we were before. I do think on the economic development piece, we just want to make sure we're not running contrary to any of the other efforts that are happening in the county that also support Reston. Supervisor Alcorn. Thank you, Madam chairman um commissioner carter thank you for joining us um i guess i wanted to start by just

[00:45:30] getting an update from you um we heard from staff you've had a couple of workshops um how's it going at the planning commission and uh are you going to be able to keep to this schedule yes and yes so we're keeping going we we have met quite a lot that we we need to be careful of of uh version creep, I guess. The notion is there are not significant changes from when the task force met, except for the things that we've talked about today. The whole project is down 50 pages.

[00:46:07] It was 180-some pages originally. It's down in the 130s and still has new chapters and new comments. That's a credit to the staff because it's more clearly written instead of sort of a creep of amendments since 1962. It's now a reworking of the whole plan. You now have one plan addressing all rest

in a similar way. You heard about the affordable housing. You heard about the environmental stewardship chapter coming down the last time we were here. We talked about

[00:46:41] concern. Is it readable? Is it doing things, even if they're unintentional, more than we anticipate? So now it's in line with county policy, and we already talked about equity and health and economic development.

[00:46:58] We're still striving about this whole readability and accessibility, and personally I'm looking for more of a pilot project that would improve our ability to make these plans more readable, more accessible to a variety of people, more graphics, more maps, more photographs.

[00:47:21] more drawings. So we're still working on that. But in general, we don't want a lot of changes since the previous plan came out, except what we've talked about. And there is concern that the people, what seems to be a small change is maybe a big change, but those things are not occurring, is my understanding. And we've met several times. We met with the Chamber of Commerce on this uh and we're working towards the may 14th uh coming out with the final staff draft

[00:47:58] uh and i think it's time to move this forward uh we've had a good session with the planning commission on this and what we would talk pretty much the way you're you're talking today so that's my notion let's move forward uh let's improve access and uh to it let's improve the look and feel of this document making it more readable uh in general so that's where we are yeah thank you thank you john and i just a few comments from me um i think it's important to note that in the existing comprehensive plan there are some areas where reston is already different specifically

[00:48:37] the wdu policy since the wdu policy was implemented in 2007 by fairfax county tyson's and reston always had a different scale. So that's no change. Something else that's not changed, Reston has always had a set of planning principles that was specific to Reston.

[00:48:59] Those are being carried forward. They've been added to a little bit, maybe updated in a couple of places. But in the existing comp plan, that is different about Reston. I think that's fine. Also, I did want to note, and John, you mentioned meeting with the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce, the task force draft, the economic development chapter, was co-written by the head of the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce.

[00:49:26] So I think some of those concepts are pretty solid. Obviously, we need to make sure they're consistent with the policy plan and flag anything that's different. But overall, I think I want to make sure we balance this in the right way because I don't want to dumb down Reston's comprehensive plan.

[00:49:51] Let's move forward with it and make it a better plan. And I think the Planning Commission is coming a long way and with staff support to getting us to the point we need to be. So thank you, Madam Chairman. I have Supervisor Walkinshaw, then Palachuk, then...

[00:50:12] Thank you, Madam Chairman, and I appreciate, Commissioner Carter, your focus on making it more accessible and readable. This wouldn't impress Supervisor Gross, but I read page one. I read some other pages, too, but page one uses the term biophilic, and I was Googling it.

[00:50:34] I'd recommend, in the spirit of making it readability, let's stick to words that normal people know and use. I don't think biophilic is one of them. But on a serious note, I do have a question just on page 52, the green buildings and stormwater management section.

[00:50:54] I'm just trying to understand and reconcile it with the policy plan. So the first bullet point says the incorporation of green building practices sufficient to attain certification through the LEED program or its equivalent is required for the Lake Ann Village Center.

[00:51:12] And then it goes on to say attainment of LEED certification or its equivalent is strongly encouraged. I assume that second sentence is strongly encouraged throughout Reston, although it's a little bit confusing. It's unclear if we're only talking about Lake Ann Village Center.

[00:51:28] But I think the strongly encouraged language is almost the same as the policy plan. I think the policy plan says encouraged. But can someone talk me through the, if I'm reading it correctly, the different standard for the Village Center? Yes, if you could give us one.

[00:51:44] Second, we have Joe Gorney from the Department of Planning and Development, and he can provide some feedback on that. One of the things we wanted to do was ensure consistency with the policy plan.

[00:52:00] And so, however, we were trying to be true to the input from the task force members who, while retaining that consistency, wanted to say there's a vision wherever possible for certain uses to be certified at a higher level.

[00:52:16] And that indeed does happen. It's happening currently with applications that we're reviewing. LEED Gold is an example. Obviously, the county is leading the way in terms of our certification of all of our county facilities. So it was a way to kind of thread that needle a little bit, retain consistency with the policy plan, while encourage people to go above and beyond, and then making sure that we give them credit for that and discuss it as part of the review of that particular development.

[00:52:44] Is there anywhere else in the comprehensive plan where we say LEED certification is required other than county buildings as opposed to encouraged, existing currently? Anywhere else where we say LEED certification is required? Well, the comprehensive plan is policy guidance, so I would be loathe to use the word required.

[00:53:06] And we obviously have adopted board policies for county facilities, so that word could very well need a little bit of massaging at this point. Madam Chairman, if I could just jump in, the Lake Ann recommendations specifically that you're referencing were carried forward, are carried forward from the existing comprehensive plan.

[00:53:27] So anyway, I'm not sure about this exact provision, but I'm pretty sure this one as well. So that's certainly something that can be looked at. Okay. I mean, I don't have any objection to it. I just wasn't aware of us doing that in any other place in the county.

[00:53:45] It wasn't clear to me that we could. So happy to explore that more. And great. Thank you. Thank you. And, you know, and I think that gets to the issues that we, that overstepping that puts us out of sync with policy plans in other places.

[00:54:04] I have Dahlia, then Rodney, then John. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you to the staff and Mr. Carter and the Planning Commission, Chair Zelsky-Eichner is here as well. Number one, fully agree this is in a much better place. I mean, it's a big undertaking, and I appreciate the more streamlined language.

[00:54:23] I think that's important. Number two, I guess we're getting to the nitpicky phase because that's where we are. So while looking at page number three, which is planning principle five, I believe, Reston will continue to offer a mix of urban and suburban lifestyles.

[00:54:41] So looking at the three, you have the metro station areas, the village centers, and the residential neighborhoods. First of all, on the nitpicky proofreading, I think in the village centers, the final line lists village centers twice, village centers, village centers, and transit stations.

[00:54:59] So I guess my first question was, was it meant to be something other than village centers, or is it just listed twice on there is a question. While you're looking at that, I did notice in the language for the three, because we are going so deeply into it, I believe in the metro station areas as well as residential neighborhoods, it does talk about ensuring a variety of housing types and sizes serving all income levels, but did not see that in the village center.

[00:55:30] So to me, that really stood out as missing from the village centers and would definitely encourage that for me, as we know, we want all of these requirements and goals, including environmental and transportation goals, but without the ability for people of all incomes being able to live in those areas, I think we are going away from the needs and the purpose of this kind of planning in the county.

[00:55:58] So I think that was my only thing I saw there, other than, you know, I think this is definitely going in the right direction. And again, just appreciate the work that's going into it and the continued outreach.

[00:56:14] Sorry, that reminds me. One more question. Looking at the chart, I do think it's a very helpful chart, and I think as was brought up, would be helpful to be able to compare it to the Tyson's AMI and affordable housing as well, because I think it's more aligned with what we're doing in Tyson. versus the county-wide. Thank you. Thank you. I have Rodney then. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

[00:56:36] I'll again make a couple of the same points I made before. I'm personally supportive of the inclusion of these sections and specifically the economic development section. I've looked at it again and just looking at the goals that are identified here, I can't see where there would be any significant issue. I mean, goal one, grow a sustainable and diversifying workforce. It's a

[00:57:04] basic item. I note here also diversify Reston's economy. Goal three, attract new and nurture existing small businesses. Seven, promote high-quality education. Again, just thinking about the intent here. We have specific points that the recommendations are neither prescriptive

[00:57:39] nor create new policy, so I appreciate that there is a direct correlation to the policy plan. I made this point back in October. I think this helps us establish maybe some revisions to the policy plan, looking at the work that has been done by this task force over this extreme number of months and meetings. I was at the Economic Development Authority for 21 years. I know the folks who worked on this language. I was there when we looked at it. And I will say, you know,

[00:58:16] again, acknowledging that Reston is a significant employment center for the county. It is poised, I will make this point again, poised to become possibly our number one business center over time.

[00:58:34] And I know Tyson's is currently still number one, but you can look at the growth. You can see what's happening on the south side of the toll road, and the opportunity is there. And I appreciate that the

community is embracing the opportunity for additional growth and expansion of the commercial tax base.

[00:58:54] the commercial tax base that this county needs to provide the critical services that our residents demand and want. And I just appreciate, you know, the work that's been done here and I'm supportive of it and hope that we can do what has been suggested, which is to include it here. So with that, I'll conclude my remarks. Thank you, John. Thank you. One issue I had was, and I'm surprised that Paul just touched on it.

[00:59:29] The proposed rest and rental TSA, I was going to ask, is that the same as we've established for Tyson's? I should know the answer to that, but I can't recall. Proposed. What is being proposed?

[00:59:45] Proposed rest and rental TSA, what is that? It is not the same as Tyson's, but again, that's something that was looked at as a comparison, but it's not the exact same as what is currently positive for Tyson's.

[01:00:01] Okay. You're going to expand this chart and compare the Tyson's. Yeah, I think that's something we can definitely do, yes. Okay. And do you know off the top of your head what the Tyson's is?

[01:00:17] Go ahead. Does Graham have that? Yeah, Supervisor Faust, thanks. Graham Owen, Department of Planning and Development. So the current Reston, excuse me, the proposed Reston rates 12%, that's the same as the adopted total percentage.

[01:00:35] The AMIs did shift down, kind of in accordance with the way that we adjusted the countywide policy two years ago. Tyson's is 13%, with a different differentiation between the 80, 70, and 60% AMI levels.

[01:00:52] So 12%, one total percentage lower. No, I mean, these percentages for Reston, in my opinion, they look very good. I mean, I'm very pleased with how that's evolved. And on the economic development thing, I look at this, I mean, I'm not sure why Reston feels it has to, you know, take a position on that.

[01:01:16] It doesn't seem to me that there's anything particularly unique. But the concern I have is that someone else might come up with something unique when they come forward with a comprehensive plan.

[01:01:36] You know, their idea of economic development in other parts of the county might be dramatically different than what Board of Supervisors has established as the policy for economic development in Fairfax County. So, I mean, I see this thing as doing no harm in terms of what's in it, but in terms of precedent, I'm concerned that we're opening up a whole new area for, you know, area-wide comprehensive plans that, you know, should be county-wide, in my opinion.

[01:02:11] Madam Chair, so appreciate my colleagues' comments and interest in Reston and suggestions.

[01:02:28] I think one of the things would be helpful for me going forward, if I could ask staff, is where there are significant issues, where there are differences between what's being proposed, to what ultimately goes in the staff report and either maybe coming from board members or where there are variations in what you're hearing to basically put together that chart of, and I know we do that for various decisions that come through the board, because I do

[01:03:07] want to make sure that the focus is on the substance of what we're looking at. What is the draft plan and where are there, you know, maybe, you know, good questions that are raised by one person, one

group or another that the board needs to consider?

[01:03:31] I know the Planning Commission is going through this as well, but I believe this will be the last time this committee and this board will hear and have a discussion about the rest and comprehensive plan until there's a public hearing, a formal public hearing.

[01:03:47] So I think to help us sort of stay on top of the issues, a document like that would be helpful. Ultimately, at the end of the day, I would hope that whatever this board adopts would be better than the existing plan.

[01:04:07] But we do have an existing comprehensive plan for Reston right now, which is some of the differences I've already made. you know, include some of that language about, you know, lead being required in the Lake Ann Village Center redevelopment. But I do want to make sure that, again, whatever we move forward with is actually a better plan for Reston. And if it's not, I wouldn't support it. So thank you all for your interest. And thank you, Madam Chairman, for getting these issues out on

[01:04:43] the table, and I look forward to the process moving forward and ultimately the Planning Commission recommendation, so thank you. Thank you, and I don't see any other questions, so I am going to adjourn the land use policy meeting.

[01:05:03] Thank you very much for all your work on this.

